Force Review Board

PREVIOUS MINUTES May 20, 2021

None

UNFINISHED

BUSINESS



CHIEF'S REPORT

(P78F)

MAY 27, 2021

TIME: 1005 TO 1135

HOURS

APD HEADQUARTERS - CHIEF'S CONFERENCE ROOM (VIA TELECONFERENCE)

FRB CHAIR Commander Elizabeth Armijo (Special Operations Bureau) (P78) DCOP Donny Olvera (Field Services Bureau) DCOP Arturo Gonzalez (Investigative Bureau) **VOTING MEMBERS** (P78) Commander Arturo Sanchez (Northwest Area Command) A/Commander (Training Academy) Judge Rod Kennedy (Legal) **NON-VOTING** Edward Harness (CPOA Director) MEMBERS Lieutenant (FRB Admin Personnel/IAFD) (P78) Julie Jaramillo (FRB Admin Personnel/AOD) Commander Cori Lowe (IAFD)- via teleconference Lieutenant (CIT) - via teleconference Sergeant (SOD/CNT) REPRESENTATIVES Sergeant (SOD) Detective (IAFD) - via teleconference Patricia Serna (OPA) - via teleconference Licutenant (SOD/Presenter) Sergeant (IAFD/Presenter) DCOP Eric Garcia (Compliance Bureau) - via teleconference Superintendent Sylvester Stanley (Police Reform) A/ Commander (COD) Sergeant (observing for IAFD) – via teleconference Detective (IAFD) – via teleconference Christine Bodo (Compliance Bureau) – via teleconference **OBSERVERS** (P78b) Elizabeth Martinez (USDOJ) - via teleconference Corey Sanders (USDOJ) - via teleconference Sara Lopez (USDOJ) - via teleconference Yvonnie Demmerritte (USDOJ) – via teleconference Phillip Coyne (IMT) – via teleconference Darreill Bone (EFIT) – via teleconference Darryl Neier (EFIT) - via teleconference Bill Hurlock (EFIT) – via teleconference

CASE #: 20-0037851

DATE OF
INCIDENT: MAY
10, 2020

LOCATION: TIMES:
DISPATCH / ON SITE:
0630 HOURS

(P78)	
CASE PRESENTER	SERGEANT
DID THE LEAD DETECTIVE PRESENT THE CASE? (P78b)	☐ YES ☑ NO ☐ NOT APPLICABLE
WHY DID THE LEAD INVESTIGATOR NOT PRESENT THE CASE?	☐ LEAD INVESTIGATOR NO LONGER IN UNIT ☐ LEAD INVESTIGATOR NOT AVAILABLE TO PRESENT ☐ LEAD INVESTIGATOR WAS CASE PRESENTER ☐ FRB DETECTIVE PRESENTER AND LEAD INVESTIGATOR PRESENT AS SME ☐ NOT AN IAFD PRESENTATION
INJURIES SUSTAINED	⊠ YES □ NO
DAMAGE TO PROPERTY	□ YES ⊠ NO
	FIELD SERVICES DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE YES NO NOT PRESENT
DID EACH VOTING MEMBER OF THE FORCE REVIEW BOARD REVIEW THE MATERIAL PRIOR TO THE MEETING? (IN THE EVENT A VOTING MEMBER DID NOT REVIEW THE MATERIAL THEY WILL BE INELIGIBLE TO VOTE ON THE CASE THIS WILL RESULT IN THE BELOW QUESTION DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE." TO BE ANSWERED "YES".)	ADMINISTRATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE YES ON NO NOT PRESENT INVESTIGATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE YES ON ONOT PRESENT TRAINING ACADEMY REPRESENTATIVE YES ON ONOT PRESENT FIELD SERVICES COMMANDER REPRESENTATIVE YES ON ONOT PRESENT
DID THE FRB REVIEW THE CASE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE COMPLETION OF THE INVESTIGATION? (P78a)	□ YES ⊠ NO
DID THE BOARD GENERATE A REFERRAL REQUESTING ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATION TO IMPROVE THE FORCE INVESTIGATION FINDINGS? (P78c)	□ YES ⊠ NO
DISCUSSION	⊠ YES □ NO
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. WITH THE INDIVIDUAL HAVING THREE PRIOR USE OF FORCE INCIDENTS, IS HE CURRENTLY IN THE CIT CASE MANAGEMENT? A. NO BUT WILL ADD. 2. AFTER THE INDIVIDUAL WAS HANDCUFFED AND IN UNIT, ANY CONSIDERATION TO WAIT FOR ANOTHER OFFICER TO BE PRESENT BEFORE PUTTING HIM IN THE PRS? A. BELIEVED OTHER OFFICERS WERE ON SCENE BUT DID NOT SEE ANYWHERE IN

- DOCUMENTATION THEY REQUESTED ANY ADDITIONAL OFFICERS
- B. PRS APPLICATION IS TAUGHT WITH TWO OFFICERS BUT TRAINING SUGGESTS TO ADD ANOTHER IF NEED BE.
- 3. OFFICERS DID A GREAT JOB EXPLAINING WHAT THEY NEEDED THE INDIVIDUAL TO DO AND EXPLAINING HOW THE PRS WOULD BE PLACED ON HIM
 - A. JOB WELL DONE WILL BE ENTERED BY DC OLVERA.
- 4. NEED TO REEDUCATE OFFICERS ABOUT NOT PUTTING
 FULL WEIGHT ON A PERSON FOR POSSIBLE POSITIONAL
 ASPHYXIA?
 - A. RECENT REFERRAL ADDRESSED THIS CONCERN AND WAS PUBLISHED IN THE FEB/MAR IAFD NEWSLETTER.
 - B. THE OFFICERS DID POSITION THEMSELVES ACCORDING TO THE TRAINING BY NOT BEARING THEIR WEIGHT ON THE INDIVIDUAL.
- 5. ANY REASON TO BELIEVE HE COULD NOT BREATHE DURING THIS CONTACT BECAUSE IT DID NOT APPEAR THAT HE HAD ANY TROUBLES?
 - A. DETECTIVE ADVISED HE DID NOT ASK THIS SPECIFIC QUESTION.
- 6. THE IDEA OF "IF YOU'RE TALKING YOU'RE BREATHING" USE TO BE A COMMON THOUGHT AMONGST OFFICERS, HAS THIS BEEN ADDRESSED?
 - A. YES IN THE RECENT TRAINING AND NEWSLETTERS.
- 7. AFTER PLACED IN PRS AND IN THE POLICE UNIT, THE STRAP TO PRS WAS CLOSED IN DOOR. TRAINING AND POLICY ADVISES NOT TO DO THIS. WAS THIS ADDRESSED DURING THE INVESTIGATION?
 - A. NONE OF THE INVESTIGATIVE DOCUMENTS ADVISE IT WAS ADDRESSED DURING THE INVESTIGATION; HOWEVER, THE RECENT RBT TRAINING ADDRESSED THIS DURING THE PRS TRAINING.
- 8. OBRD CONFUSION AS TO THE OFFICER USING ANOTHER OFFICER'S OBRD, HOW WAS THIS ADDRESSED?
 - A. LIEUTENANT JSED ANOTHER
 OFFICER'S OBRD DUE TO HIS BEING
 INOPERABLE. HE PROPERLY INSURED HE HAD A
 WORKING OBRD FOR HIS SHIFT.
- 9. STATUS ON SEARCH AND SEIZURE TRAINING?
 - A. A NEW CTU MANAGER STARTED, WHICH WILL ASSIST TO SPEED UP THE PACE OF PREPARING TRAINING. THEY ARE CURRENTLY READING THROUGH THE TRAINING.
- 10. CURRENT TIMELINE FOR SEARCH AND SEIZURE NEWSLETTER?
 - A. NEWSLETTER PUSHED TO COMMANDER LOWE TO REVIEW, UNKNOWN CURRENT TIMELINE.
- 11. DOES DIRECTOR HARNESS GET THE QUARTERLY USE OF FORCE REPORTS?

			A. QUARTERLY REPORT GOES TO FORCE REVIEW BOARD EMAIL EVERY QUARTER; THEREFORE, DIRECTOR HARNESS RECEIVES IT AS WELL.			
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO			DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, IDENTIFY CONCERNS, DEFICIENCIES, OR SUCCESSES NOT IDENTIFIED BY THE CASE PRESENTER FOR:			
(P78e)	POLICY	TACTICS	EQUIPMENT	TRAINING	SUPERVISION	SUCCESSES
	☐ YES ⊠ NO	☐ YES ⊠ NO	☐ YES ⊠ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ⊠ NO	⊠ YES □ NO
WAS A POLICY VIOLATION IDENTIFIED BY THE BOARD?			☐ YES 🖾 NO			10-14 - 1111 - 41111 - 41111 - 41111
ENTER	ONNEL RESPON RING THE INTER RS REQUEST (I	RNAL	N/A			
SOP TI	TLE OF VIOLAT	ION	N/A			
ACTIVATION			ACTIVATION IN		NLY: WAS THE TAN WITH THE DEPAR OCOLS?	
MAJORITY VOTE			☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NOT A TACTICAL ACTIVATION			
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO			FOR TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS ONLY: ARE THERE ANY OTHER CONCERNS, DEFICIENCIES, OR SUCCESSES RELATED TO THE UNITS THAT REQUESTED TACTICAL SUPPORT NOT IDENTIFIED BY THE CASE PRESENTER?			
MAJORITY VOTE			☐ YES ☐ NO	⊠ NOT A TACTIO	CAL ACTIVATION	
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO			FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, VOTE THAT THE IAFD INVESTIGATION WAS THOROUGH AND COMPLETE? (P78a)			
MAJORITY VOTE		☑ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION				
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO			FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, DETERMINE THAT THE UOF IS CONSISTENT WITH DEPARTMENT POLICY? (P78d)			
MAJO	RITY VOTE		✓ YES □ NO □ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION			
FAIL T	NY MEMBER IN TO VOTE?	ATTENDANCE	MAJORITY VOT	E, DETERMINE T SUPPORTED BY	<u>Y:</u> DID THE FRB, HAT THE IAFD IN THE PREPONDER	VESTIGATOR'S
MAJOI	RITY VOTE					

	☑ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION
DID THE CPOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STATEMENT TO THE PRESENTER? ☑ YES ☐ NO	R HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QUESTIONS OR MAKE A
DISCUSSION TOPICS	OBSERVATION THERE IS A RISE IN NON-RECORDED EVENTS OCCURRING AND SUGGESTS IT TO BE TRACKED THROUGH FRB TO SEE IF THIS IS A CONCERNING TREND.
Diodecicit 101 100	A. QUARTERLY AND ANNUAL USE OF FORCE REPORTS DO TRACK THIS INFORMATION. 2. IN POLICY.

DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE FOR THE REFERRAL? □ YES □ NO ☑ IAR	REFERRAL INFORMATION
TYPE OF REFERRAL(S):	☐ POLICY ☐ POLICY VIOLATION (IAR) ☐ TRAINING ☐ SUPERVISION ☐ EQUIPMENT ☐ TACTICS ☑ SUCCESS (IAR)
REFERRAL(S):	THE FRB HAS IDENTIFIED A DEFICIENCY/CONCERN RELATED TO A SUCCESS DEPUTY CHIEF OLVERA WILL COMPLETE A JOB WELL DONE FOR THE OFFICERS FOR THEIR EXCEPTIONAL EFFORTS WHEN EXPLAINING WHAT THEY NEEDED THE INDIVIDUAL TO DO AND HOW THE PRS WOULD BE PLACED ON THE INDIVIDUAL
EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBLE FOR RESPONDING TO REFERRAL(S): (P78e)	DEPUTY CHIEF DONOVAN OLVERA
DEADLINE: (P78e)	JUNE 14, 2021

CASE #: 21-0000728 TYPE: SOD (P78)	DATE OF INCIDENT: JANUARY 3-4, 2021	LOCATION:	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 2339 HOURS CALL TO TACTICAL: 0111 HOURS SWAT ACTIVATION: 0349 HOURS
CASE PRESENTER	LIEUTENANT		

DID THE LEAD DETECTIVE PRESENT THE CASE? (P78b)	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NOT APPLICABLE
WHY DID THE LEAD INVESTIGATOR NOT PRESENT THE CASE?	☐ LEAD INVESTIGATOR NO LONGER IN UNIT ☐ LEAD INVESTIGATOR NOT AVAILABLE TO PRESENT ☐ LEAD INVESTIGATOR WAS CASE PRESENTER ☐ FRB DETECTIVE PRESENTER AND LEAD INVESTIGATOR PRESENT AS SME ☑ NOT AN IAFD PRESENTATION
INJURIES SUSTAINED	□ YES Ø NO
DAMAGE TO PROPERTY	⊠ YES □ NO
DID EACH VOTING MEMBER OF THE FORCE REVIEW BOARD REVIEW THE MATERIAL PRIOR TO THE MEETING? (IN THE EVENT A VOTING MEMBER DID NOT REVIEW THE MATERIAL THEY WILL BE INELIGIBLE TO VOTE ON THE CASE. THIS WILL RESULT IN THE BELOW QUESTION. "DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE." TO BE ANSWERED 'YES.") DID THE FRB REVIEW THE CASE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE COMPLETION OF THE INVESTIGATION?	FIELD SERVICES DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE YES NO NOT PRESENT ADMINISTRATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE YES NO NOT PRESENT INVESTIGATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE YES NO NOT PRESENT TRAINING ACADEMY REPRESENTATIVE YES NO NOT PRESENT FIELD SERVICES COMMANDER REPRESENTATIVE YES NO NOT PRESENT
(P78a) DID THE BOARD GENERATE A REFERRAL REQUESTING ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATION TO IMPROVE THE FORCE INVESTIGATION FINDINGS? (P78c)	□ YES ⊠ NO
DISCUSSION	⊠ YES □ NO
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. WAS IT THE INTENT OF THE DEPLOYMENT OF THE NFDD TO BREAK THE WINDOW? A. NO. ON INITIAL DEPLOYMENT, SOD GAVE AMPLE TIME FOR THE INDIVIDUAL TO RESPOND. WHEN THEY DID NOT RECEIVE A RESPONSE, SOD DEPLOYED THE SECOND NFDD, WHICH DEFLECTED, CAUSING THE WINDOW TO BREAK. 2. WOULD THIS BE SOMETHING TO CONSIDER IN FUTURE ACTIVATIONS WHEN DEALING WITH A SIMILAR WINDOW? A. THIS WAS THE FIRST WINDOW BROKEN WITH AN NEED APPEARED TO BE A STATISTICAL OUTLIER.

				SO IT DOES NOT SEEM TO BE A CONCERN AT THIS TIME.				
			3.		OULD IT BE TRAC			
				A. A	GREED. WILL PR	OPERLY DOCUM		
			4		OVING FORWAR)	
			"	COMMUN	VICATION WITH G	IRLFRIEND, THE	Ү ВОТН	
				IMPLIED THE INDIVIDUAL WAS GOING TO COME OUT, WHAT PRECAUTIONS WERE TAKEN TO ENSURE THE				
		FERRIT - 4, MI - 464-547; NAX - 4-47			IAL WAS NOT GO ME THE NFDD WA			
				S.	SING CNT'S EXPI TALL TACTIC BY O INTENTIONS O	THE INDIVIDUAL		
			5.		SCUSSION OCCL ITS TO ENSURE I			
				A. S	OD COMMANDER			
				A	RITERIA IS MET 1 UTHORIZATION I	S COVERED AND	THE NEEDED	
					ERBIAGE IS INCL OT A TYPICAL CO			
	6			Al	ND ONLY WHEN I	T IS A QUESTION	IABLE	
				TIMEFRAME, NEARING 2200 HOURS, SOD COMMANDER WILL ENSURE THIS CONCERN IS				
				IVI	ET.			
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE?		DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, IDENTIFY CONCERNS, DEFICIENCIES, OR SUCCESSES NOT IDENTIFIED BY THE CASE PRESENTER FOR:						
☐ YES	S 🖾 NO							
(P78e)	POLICY	TACTICS	-	PMENT	TRAINING	SUPERVISION	SUCCESSES	
10/45/	☐ YES ☑ NO	☐ YES ⊠ NO	☐ YE	S NO	☐ YES ⊠ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	
	IFIED BY THE E		□ YES ⊠ NO					
PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE FOR ENTERING THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS REQUEST (IAR)		N/A						
SOP TITLE OF VIOLATION		N/A						
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE?		FOR TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS ONLY: WAS THE TACTICAL						
□ YES ⊠ NO		ACTIVATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DEPARTMENT'S SPECIALIZED RESPONSE PROTOCOLS?						
	S 🖾 NO			ATION IN	ACCORDANCE V		TMENT'S	
MAJO	RITY VOTE		SPEC	/ATION IN IALIZED R	ACCORDANCE V	OCOLS?	TMENT'S	
DID AI FAIL T	***************************************	ATTENDANCE	SPEC SPEC SPEC SPEC ONC UNITS	ATION IN IALIZED R S D NO FACTICAL CERNS, DE	ACCORDANCE V	AL ACTIVATION NLY: ARE THERE SUCCESSES REL	ANY OTHER	

MAJORITY VOTE	☐ YES ☑ NO ☐ NOT A TACTICAL ACTIVATION		
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO	FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, VOTE THAT THE IAFD INVESTIGATION WAS THOROUGH AND COMPLETE? (P76a)		
MAJORITY VOTE	☐ YES ☐ NO ☑ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION		
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO	FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, DETERMINE THAT THE UOF IS CONSISTENT WITH DEPARTMENT POLICY? (P78d)		
MAJORITY VOTE	☐ YES ☐ NO ☑ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION		
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO	FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, DETERMINE THAT THE IAFD INVESTIGATOR'S FINDINGS ARE SUPPORTED BY THE PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE? (P78a)		
MAJORITY VOTE	☐ YES ☐ NO ⊠ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION		
DID THE CPOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STATEMENT TO THE PRESENTER? ☑ YES ☐ NO	R HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QU	JESTIONS OR MAKE A	
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1 NONE		
CASE #: 20-0081816 TYPE: SOD	DATE OF LOCATION: INCIDENT: OCTOBER 9, 2020	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 1738 HOURS CALL TO TACTICAL: 1927 HOURS SWAT ACTIVATION:	
(P78) CASE PRESENTER	LIEUTENANT	2114 HOURS	
DID THE LEAD DETECTIVE PRESENT THE CASE? (P78b)	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NOT APPLICABLE		
WHY DID THE LEAD INVESTIGATOR NOT PRESENT THE	☐ LEAD INVESTIGATOR NO LONGER ☐ LEAD INVESTIGATOR NOT AVAILA ☐ LEAD INVESTIGATOR WAS CASE P	BLE TO PRESENT	

PRESENT AS SIVE

CASE?

☐ FRB DETECTIVE PRESENTER AND LEAD INVESTIGATOR

	☑ NOT AN IAFD PRESENTATION		
INJURIES SUSTAINED	⊠ YES □ NO		
DAMAGE TO PROPERTY	⊠ YES □ NO		
DID EACH VOTING MEMBER OF THE FORCE REVIEW BOARD	FIELD SERVICES DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE YES NO NOT PRESENT ADMINISTRATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE YES NO NOT PRESENT		
REVIEW THE MATERIAL PRIOR TO THE MEETING? (IN THE EVENT A VOTING MEMBER DID NOT REVIEW THE MATERIAL THEY WILL BE INELIGIBLE TO VOTE ON THE CASE THIS	INVESTIGATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE YES NO NOT PRESENT		
WILL RESULT IN THE BELOW QUESTION, "DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE," TO BE ANSWERED "YES")	TRAINING ACADEMY REPRESENTATIVE VES NO NOT PRESENT		
	FIELD SERVICES COMMANDER REPRESENTATIVE YES NO NOT PRESENT		
DID THE FRB REVIEW THE CASE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE COMPLETION OF THE INVESTIGATION? (P78a)	□ YES ⊠ NO		
DID THE BOARD GENERATE A REFERRAL REQUESTING ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATION TO IMPROVE THE FORCE INVESTIGATION FINDINGS? (P78c)	□ YES 🖾 NO		
DISCUSSION	⊠ YES □ NO		
DISCUSSION TOPICS	 THIS CASE IS STILL BEING REVIEWED BY IAFD? A. YES. NEEDS TO BE A PRIORITY CASE FOR IAFD TO COMPLETE FOR FRB REVIEW. A. REFERRAL FOR HAVING IAFD TO MAKE THIS CASE A PRIORITY TO BE COMPLETED. IS THE INDIVIDUAL ON CIT CASE DATABASE? A. NO. B. SPOKE TO VA CHARGE NURSE THAT NIGHT WHO CONFIRMED THE INDIVIDUAL HAS NO HISTORY ON MENTAL HEALTH. IS THE INVOLVED PSD STILL IN SERVICE? A. NO, HE IS RETIRED. WHAT WERE THE ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS? A. THERE WAS A TRUCK IMPEDING THE PSD'S VIEW OF THE INDIVIDUAL. THIS CAUSED THE PSD TO GO TOWARDS THE TRUCK 		

DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE?			6. WAS THIS ADDRESSED WITH THE HANDLERS TO MAKE SURE THESE CONSIDERATIONS ARE BEING IDENTIFIED AND PROPERLY HANDLED WHEN THEY OCCUR? A. YES. 7. WHAT IS SOD DOING TO ENSURE THE COMMUNICATION ISSUES BETWEEN CNT AND SOD DO NOT HAPPEN. A. SOD NOW CHECKS WITH CNT PRIOR TO CONTACT WITH THE INDIVIDUAL TO GET ANY INFORMATION IMMEDIATELY. B. OPEN COMMUNICATION WITH COMMAND POST TO FRONT LINES TO ENSURE THIS DOES NOT OCCUR. DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, IDENTIFY CONCERNS, DEFICIENCIES, OR SUCCESSES NOT IDENTIFIED BY THE CASE PRESENTER FOR:				
(P78e):	S 🖾 NO	TACTICS	EQUIPMENT	TRAINING	SUPERVISION	SUCCESSES	
	☐ YES ⊠ NO		☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	⊠ YES □ NO	☐ YES ⊠ NO	
	A POLICY VIOLA	ATION	☐ YES ⊠ NO			2 120 2 110	
ENTE	ONNEL RESPON RING THE INTER IRS REQUEST (I	RNAL	N/A	N/A			
SOP TI	TLE OF VIOLAT	ION	N/A				
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO			FOR TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS ONLY: WAS THE TACTICAL ACTIVATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DEPARTMENT'S SPECIALIZED RESPONSE PROTOCOLS?				
MAJORITY VOTE			⊠ YES □ NO	□ NOT A TACTIC	AL ACTIVATION		
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? □ YES ⊠ NO			FOR TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS ONLY: ARE THERE ANY OTHER CONCERNS, DEFICIENCIES, OR SUCCESSES RELATED TO THE UNITS THAT REQUESTED TACTICAL SUPPORT NOT IDENTIFIED BY THE CASE PRESENTER?				
MAJORITY VOTE			☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ NOT A TACTICAL ACTIVATION				
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☑ NO			FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, VOTE THAT THE IAFD INVESTIGATION WAS THOROUGH AND COMPLETE? (P78a)				
MAJORITY VOTE			☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION				
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO			FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, DETERMINE THAT THE UOF IS CONSISTENT WITH DEPARTMENT POLICY? (P78d)				

MAJORITY VOTE	☐ YES ☐ NO ☑ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION			
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANC FAIL TO VOTE? □ YES ⊠ NO	FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, DETERMINE THAT THE IAFD INVESTIGATOR'S FINDINGS ARE SUPPORTED BY THE PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE? (P78a)			
MAJORITY VOTE	☐ YES ☐ NO ☑ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION			
DID THE CPOA EXECUTIVE DIRECT STATEMENT TO THE PRESENTER? ☑ YES □ NO	OR HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QUESTIONS OR MAKE A			
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. NONE			
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE FOR THE REFERRAL? □ YES ☒ NO □ IAR	REFERRAL INFORMATION			
TYPE OF REFERRAL(S): (P78e)	☐ POLICY ☐ POLICY VIOLATION (IAR) ☐ TRAINING ☑ SUPERVISION ☐ EQUIPMENT ☐ TACTICS ☐ SUCCESS (IAR)			
(P78e)	THE FRB HAS IDENTIFIED A DEFICIENCY/CONCERN RELATED TO SUPERVISION. COMMANDER LOWE WILL ENSURE THIS CASE IS PRIORITIZED FOR COMPLETION IN ORDER FOR IT TO BE REVIEWED BY THE FRB.			
EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBLE FOR RESPONDING TO REFERRAL(S): (P78e)	COMMANDER CORI LOWE			
DEADLINE: (P78e)	JUNE 28, 2021			
Next FRB Meeting: June 3, 2021				

Signed: Harold Medina, Chief of Police